

## REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated July 15, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 21-43 have been withdrawn by virtue of the Restriction Requirement dated February 11, 2003. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (GB 2,343,012A) (hereinafter “Kim”). Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,824 to den Boer (hereinafter “den Boer”).

Applicants amend independent claims 1, 10, and 16 to clarify further the features of the invention recited in the claims.

The rejection of claims 1-20 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-20 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 16 including, for example, “at least a portion of the dielectric frame blocking light as a light shielding layer and the dielectric frame surrounding each domain”. None of the cited references including Kim, or den Boer, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In particular, the structure of claims 1, 10, and 16 of the present invention is different from the Kim and den Boer structure in that they do not disclose or suggest “at least a portion of the dielectric frame blocking light as a light shielding layer and the dielectric frame surrounding each domain” as recited in claims 1, 10, and 16. In fact the Examiner does not address the feature of “the dielectric frame surrounding each domain”. In addition, Kim discloses only that the dielectric frame “is formed on the pixel electrode 13 or the common electrode 17” (Kim,

page 9, lines 5-6), but does not discuss at all “the dielectric frame surrounding each domain” as recited in claims 1, 10, and 16. The Examiner does not cite den Boer as disclosing the dielectric frame.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 10, and 16, and claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-20, which depend from claims 1, 10, and 16, respectively, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing arguments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
George G. Bellas  
Registration No.: 52,587  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant